January 3, 2007

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 47 and 48

1	Item 47 - Abeyance Item - Discussion and possible action to retain legal services of
2	Chevalier, Allen and Lichman to represent the City of Las Vegas in an appeal of the FAA
3	record of decision regarding the proposed right turn at McCarran International Airport
4	
5	Item 48 - Discussion and possible action to award Contract No. 070128 for Aviation
6	Consultant Services - Department of Government and Community Affairs - Award
7	recommend to: WILLIAMS AVIATION CONSULTANTS, INC.
8	
9	
10	
11	Appearance List:
12	OSCAR GOODMAN, Mayor
13	BRAD JERBIC, City Attorney
14	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN, Costa Mesa, California
15	STEVE WOLFSON, Councilman
16	LARRY BROWN, Councilman
17	LOIS TARKANIAN, Councilwoman
18	GARY REESE, Councilman
19	STEVEN D. ROSS, Councilman
20	
21	32 minutes
22	
23	Typed by: Ydoleena Yturralde
24	Proofed by: Lean Coleman

January 3, 2007

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 47 and 48

25	MAYOR GOODMAN
23	MATUK GUUDMAN

- 26 Item 47. I'll read this in conjunction with 47 and 48. Forty-seven is discussion and possible
- 27 action to retain legal services of Chevalier, Allen and Lichman to represent the City of Las Vegas
- 28 in an appeal of the FAA record of decision regarding the proposed right turn at McCarran
- 29 International Airport.
- 30 Forty-eight is discussion and possible action to award Contract Number 070128 for Aviation
- 31 Consultant Services, Department of Government and Community Affairs. Award recommended
- 32 to Williams Aviation Consultants, Inc. These pertain to all the wards. Mr. Jerbic.

33

34

BRAD JERBIC

- 35 Thank you, Your Honor, and members of the Council and Happy New Year to everyone. You
- asked that we hold this item for a couple of weeks after Christmas so that I could call Barbara
- 37 Lichman and have her present today to answer any questions the Council has regarding any
- 38 potential litigation you wish to have read to you, challenge you and the proposed right hand turn
- 39 at McCarran International Airport. The other item, just for the record, is Item 46 which I asked
- 40 earlier to be stricken has been replaced with Item number 48 which is an actual contract with
- 41 Williams Aviation. As you can see, we had originally recommended a \$100,000 set aside for
- Williams Aviation. It came down to \$57,000 as a result of us in contract negotiations, that's
- 43 \$42,000 in contract costs and up to \$15,000 in reimbursable expenses for Williams Aviation.
- 44 That's on Item number 48. And with that, Your Honor, I will introduce you to Dr. Barbara
- Lichman, who will be glad to answer any discussions regarding all information

46

47

MAYOR GOODMAN

48 Very good. Dr. Lichman, would you like to make some preliminary observations to us?

49

50

DR. BARBARA LICHMAN

- 51 Thank you, Mr. Mayor, members of the Council and thank you, City Attorney Mr. Jerbic. My
- 52 name is Barbara Lichman. I am from Costa Mesa. My office is in Costa Mesa, California and
- we specialize in issues involving airport development. There are many communities in your

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF January 3, 2007

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 47 and 48

position. That position is located off the end of a runway of a large and expanding airport. The
impact of that size and the span to Carlton visited upon residential communities under flight
path. In this case, our understanding is that there will be a change in the operation clause phases,
not a necessarily, it's not a physical expansion issue. change in operations which will take a turn
for the aircraft once we parted the end of the runway. Instead of going, turning to the left or
south, they will turn to the right or north about 35 percent of the time. Our further understanding
is that there are new communities located to the north and east of the airport which were not
there back in 2001 when this procedure was originally recommended. It was rejected by the
FAA at that time, but now it's been reinstituted for the alleged reason of increasing efficiency at
the airport by not forcing all the aircraft to go over the same fixes, and therefore requiring some
distance, increased distance between (inaudible) of stuff. The bottom line is that right turn may
have some substantial noise impact over communities to the north of the airport. There is also
another very important issue that has been given short thrift in the analysis provided by the
airport and the FAA and that is air quality impacts. They were not analyzed, and as you know,
this region is in serious (inaudible) on various pollutants, criteria pollutants that the EPA looks at
to being important including carbon monoxide and particulate matter. And it is the view of our
consultants so far, and it is preliminary, that the proposed right turn will cause increased air
quality impacts by, and this is directly contrary to what is being said in this environmental report,
by causing increased taxitocs (sic) by forcing aircrafts to sit at the end of the runway while
waiting for coordination from Nellis Airforce (inaudible). Now, the issue of noise is going to be
relatively confined, relatively I said. But the issue of air quality is going to be region wide and
it's something with which not only the City of Las Vegas but the County, Clark County, and the
United States of America is very concerned. And we believe that it requires further analysis
before this procedure can go into effect. One more thing and then I'll (inaudible). There are
some safety issues involved here, and those are conflicts with Nellis and with North Las Vegas,
and our consultant with whom we have worked, our firm has worked on every project over the
last ten years. He is quite convinced that there will be these conflicts. He, by the way, you'll be
looking at his contract, he was the Air Space Manager for the Western Pacific Region of the
FAA. He was Tower Manager for Chicago O'Hare, he was also Tower Manager at LAX. I

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF January 3, 2007

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 47 and 48

mean, he has background to know these things, and he is convinced that there will be increased safety issues. And those are preliminary comments. I'll give you more when I have more but they become quite obvious on review.

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

83

84

85

MAYOR GOODMAN

Okay, I appreciate that. I think it's important that the public understands where the Council will be coming from assuming they support the retention of your firm and Mr. Williams' firm. I was, the issue that struck me the most when I read Mr. Williams' comments was the safety issue. I think that we, as a City Council, owe this community the obligation as part of our position of trust to do everything we can to make sure that the health and well-being of our constituents is protected. And the - emphasis was, on that particular aspect as far as my feelings on the retention. The – first time that I really have been advised of the separate issue of attainment under air quality is today. That has not necessarily been emphasized in any of the briefings that have taken place and I know how important that is because if we are not within attainment, all the federal dollars that come into this area for roads and for improvements and those things that do sustain our quality of life were terminated. We've been through this not only with particular matter but ozone and carbon monoxide and we've always been on the cusp, so to speak, of being within attainment, going out of attainment and whatever. The fact that you say that this is not just Las Vegas' problem at this point in time but the County's problem should open up their eyes, and they should begin to think in terms of their constituents as well and the community in general because they will be sorely affected if, in fact, we fall out of attainment due to the right hand turn. I'm going to propose and, of course, my colleagues are gonna be heard on this matter. I'm going to propose that the retention take place but conditionally. Not to show any weakness, of course, but to make sure that we as the stewards of the tax payer monies are able to do our job knowledgably and being use, being able to use prudence in our decision making. I'm going to put as a requirement, after the motion is made, that you report to us on a monthly basis. And certainly not to the detriment of a lawsuit or to your legal action, if necessary, you can brief us individually if you feel that a public briefing is not appropriate and justify whatever fees are being billed on an hourly basis to the City during that briefing. And if, in fact, at any time we

January 3, 2007

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 47 and 48

feel that we're either not going to prevail or that the fight is a – futile fight, then we have to bring
it back for further discussion on a public basis to make sure that the public is kept aware as to
exactly what we're doing. It's important to me that the folks who live in this Valley understand
that, at least in my opinion, this is not just Las Vegas' problem. This is the community's
problem. If, God forbid, there be an accident caused as a result of the congestion and the issues
that you point out on the right hand turn from McCarran, taking into consideration North Las
Vegas or Nellis, that will have a devastating affect not only on the folks who are in the plane and
under the plane but also on our economy because we have a tourist-based economy. It's a very
sensitive economy. People elect to come here. If there's any kind of an inference that the public
could draw that there is a safety issue when you fly into or out of Las Vegas, that would have a
debilitating effect on the community as we know it today. So, I want the folks who have written
to my office that they know that this is not a rich man, poor man issue, this is not a Summerlin
versus Ward 3 issue. This is an issue that pertains to all of us in the City here and you have made
it into an issue today that pertains to all of us in the Valley here, and I hope that the County is
listening because this isn't just, it's not gonna be a freebee form. But this is – I think this is a very
important matter based on the information that I received, and I think we would be derelict in our
duty not to pursue it. That's my position. I'm happy to hear from my colleagues.

COUNCILMAN WOLFSON

131 Mayor Goodman.

MAYOR GOODMAN

134 Councilman Wolfson.

COUNCILMAN WOLFSON

137 Thank you. First of all, you've been referred to as Doctor. Are you a doctor?

DR. BARBARA LICHMAN

140 Yes. Not a medical doctor. I have a PhD in urban and regional planning from, forgive me, the

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF January 3, 2007 VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 47 and 48

141	University of Southern California.
142	
143	COUNCILMAN WOLFSON
144	Okay. Well, Dr., thank you for coming today. I do have a series of questions and I'd ask the
145	Council for their indulgence. And I fully recognize that I don't wanna tip our hand. This is a
146	public setting here, we're being recorded and, for all I know, the FAA is listening and taking
147	notes. So, I certainly don't want to show our hand. You've done an anissle (sic), an initial case
148	assessment, I'm sure. Without going into detail, do you think we have a case that can be won?
149	
150	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
151	As we, we spoke earlier.
152	
153	COUNCILMAN WOLFSON
154	Mm-hm.
155	
156	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
157	And that would depend on the definition of winning. The answer is, of course, we're not going to
158	proceed in a case that we feel is a dead bang loser. It doesn't pay us and it doesn't pay you.
159	Losing is not a good recommendation for a law firm. So, to take a loosing case would be like
160	bidding hara-kiri; however, in cases of this nature the Federal Government, unlike in a normal
161	court case, the Federal Government gets extreme deference from the courts for its decisions.

Therefore, the burden of proof is on us to show that the decision was not based on substantial

evidence. We believe, based on a preliminary evaluation, that on the issuance of, for example,

air quality, potentially cumulative impact, which goes with the safety issue, and, of course, the

derivative issue of alternatives, we can do that. But we like to use quantitative methods that our

consultants provide us, our air-quality consultants, to show that the way that the analysis was

conducted was flawed. The courts respond very favorable to that. So the answer to your

question, yes, we think we can win this case, we think based on a preliminary evaluation, but

with a monthly report. And if, at any time, we feel that our consult - for instance, if our

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

January 3, 2007

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 47 and 48

170	consultant comes back and says, no, they were right, their numbers are good, in that case, I would
171	recommend to this Council that the case be abandoned and whatever amount of money has been
172	spent up to that time would be spent. But I think it would be a much attenuative (?) sum.
173	
174	COUNCILMAN WOLFSON
175	And you are the lawyer who will be the primary lawyer working on this case?
176	
177	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
178	Yes.
179	
180	COUNCILMAN WOLFSON
181	I've been asked by a number of constituents if we can file for injunctive relief, because it's my
182	understanding that the proposed right turn is scheduled to begin some time in mid March. That's
183	a couple months away. Is there a chance where we could ask and attain some sort of court order
184	prohibiting them from instituting the right turn.
185	
186	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
187	It's unlikely but not impossible, and my explanation is as follows: Because the standard of
188	review for injunctive relief is, one of them, one of the elements is irreparable injury as the
189	lawyers on this Council know. You have to demonstrate irreparable injury. If this procedure
190	were to start and then be stopped at some later date, it would be hard to show that there was some
191	sort of a irreparable injury except potentially if the air quality analysis is so flawed that it would
192	somehow deeply impact the compliance with the state implementation plan. Even in a
193	preliminary, even if it began, then maybe we could get it. But I think on the irreparable injury,
194	the probability of prevailing, maybe. Irreparable injury, probably not. It's not like a construction
195	project where they put up that building it's not coming down. You have irreparable injury.
196	
197	COUNCILMAN WOLFSON

One of the things I'm a little concerned with is that if the right turn goes into effect in mid March

Page 7 of 19

198

January 3, 2007

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 47 and 48

199	and we began our – appellate process, if you will, in the next couple of weeks. This litigation
200	could take how long? Six months? Twelve months? Eighteen months? How long?

DR. BARBARA LICHMAN

It depends on if the Ninth Circuit sends us, this is going to the Court of Appeals, the Federal Court of Appeals. That's required by the Airport and Airway Development Act. If the court sends us into mediation, it will take longer. But there are very firm prescribed schedules and, of course, as soon as we file within a week or two, we'll send a – schedule for the provision. The – Justice Department will provide the administrative record within a certain period of time. We will negotiate that to be as speedy as possible. We will have to review the administrative record to see a basis for their decision making if any, and then the briefing schedule will be worked out. Could be nine months. If there's mediation, it could be longer but mediation could help us and attenuate this suit tremendously. Because if we are correct on the numbers, the mediation will provide the forum in which we can negotiate a relief from this matter. Because, for them, if we're right on the air quality numbers, they'll have to stop dead in their tracks because of the conformity rule. So, there will be a basis for negotiation at that point. I'd say we'd go three months before we determine that. Three – months to four months before we determine that.

COUNCILMAN WOLFSON

One of the things I'm concerned about is that if they start their right turn in mid March, knowing that we are challenging and fighting that decision, and that this fight could well go into spring, summer, fall, winter of 07, can they adjust the number of flights that are gonna be making this right turn, the manner of the flights, the number of the flights, etcetera, to have a lesser impact, knowing that if they schedule flights as they originally proposed, it would have a greater impact? In other words, can they do that to try to appease the City of Las Vegas residents while this litigation is pending?

DR. BARBARA LICHMAN

227 Oh, yes. They have flexibility as to when to use that right hand turn. That's what this whole

January 3, 2007

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 47 and 48

228	thing's really about, to give them the flexibility to change the direction of the turn when they need
229	it to accommodate capacity overload.
230	
231	COUNCILMAN WOLFSON
232	Okay. But my point is, will – we be monitoring this right turn when it goes into effect in March
233	during the litigation so as to gage whether or not they're playing with their number of planes and
234	the type of planes and the path of the airplanes? You know, if all of a sudden it's April or May,
235	and we're not hearing much and all of a sudden my constituents say, "Well, it's not as noisy as I
236	thought," are we gonna be able to monitor whether or not they're playing games with us?
237	
238	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
239	Oh, yeah. It's on – the internet. It's easy. I could do it today if you wanted to.
240	
241	COUNCILMAN WOLFSON
242	And is that where Williams comes into play?
243	
244	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
245	Yes.
246	
247	COUNCILMAN WOLFSON
248	Are they gonna be doing that?
249	
250	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
251	Yes. It's easy. You can call it up at any moment and you then you get –
252	
253	COUNCILMAN WOLFSON
254	And you –

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF Innuary 3, 2007

255	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
256	– a 20-minute delay.
257	
258	COUNCILMAN WOLFSON
259	You already answered my question. You've worked with this Williams Aviation expert on many
260	cases over many years.
261	
262	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
263	That's right. Absolutely. He's – a treasure. He's absolutely terrific.
264	
265	COUNCILMAN WOLFSON
266	Well, thank you for coming and answering the questions. Mayor, I'm gonna certainly support
267	your motion. I represent people that live out in the western area that are probably, on a sheer
268	numbers basis, the most affected and the greatest affected. And in the last year or so that this
269	issue has been on the – forefront of people's minds, probably about 98 percent of the people that I
270	represent want us to fight. I'm also mindful of spending taxpayer's money. We're talking about a
271	lot of money here, but in my opinion when we talk about the air quality impacts, as the Mayor
272	noticed, are Valley wide, if you will. Public safety is, not only Valley wide but state wide. God
273	forbid something drastic or tragic would occur. It could affect our economy state wide and then
274	in particular the noise impact for the people that I represent. And I've been elected to voice their
275	feelings and their concerns and with very few dissention, they are all in favor of fighting this
276	fight. Thank you, Mayor.
277	
278	MAYOR GOODMAN
279	Thank you. Councilman Brown.
280	
281	COUNCILMAN BROWN
282	Thank you, Your Honor. Dr., just a couple quick questions. One is, when it comes to the FAA,
283	do they have the discretion or the ability to just change operations at an airport? Is that within

284	their scope that they could –
285	
286	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
287	Well, it must be generally speaking, the airport asks for that change. They don't just walk in and
288	say, you know, we've decided to make all these changes. Usually, the airport asks for it. Now,
289	there are over arching changes, like the east coast, four – four-corner post plan were instituted for
290	a number of years. Those are long term. Many years that planned on with the cooperation of
291	(inaudible) airport. So, the answer to your question is it's rarely done on the airport by airport
292	basis without the request of the airport.
293	
294	COUNCILMAN BROWN
295	And you jumped ahead to my second question.
296	
297	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
298	Sorry.
299	
300	COUNCILMAN BROWN
301	There seems to - no, it's perfect. I mean, you're out in front of me already. There seems to be a
302	lack of a definitive answer to the question: Who initiated this? Was it, I've heard, at least, from
303	either reporting or talking to different colleagues that the airlines asked for it, the FAA just
304	thought it was a capacity issue, the County may have been involved. Is it possible in your
305	preliminary work to find that out? Is it written somewhere or can someone answer that directly?
306	
307	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
308	I think I know already.
309	
310	COUNCILMAN BROWN
311	Okay. And I'll, you don't – have to answer that yet.

312	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
313	Oh, okay.
314	
315	COUNCILMAN BROWN
316	I'll be surprised. And just so I understand, the final question is the, at least publicly, the
317	justification or the reasoning behind this right hand turn has been increased efficiency at
318	McCarran. Is that –
319	
320	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
321	That is correct.
322	
323	COUNCILMAN BROWN
324	Okay. Thank you. Likewise, Your Honor, I will be supporting your motion for many reasons but
325	mostly because I think there's some, there are answers out there that we have not been given and
326	the expertise that's before us today, I think, will provide the Council and our citizens those
327	answers that they have demanded.
328	
329	MAYOR GOODMAN
330	Thank you. Any other comments or questions?
331	
332	COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN
333	Mr. Mayor.
334	
335	MAYOR GOODMAN
336	Yes. Councilwoman.
337	
338	COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN
339	I agree with Councilman Brown on the fact that there are a lot of questions, and the same thing is
340	coming to me from residents of the ward I represent and these questions need to be answered. I

January 3, 2007

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 47 and 48

wanted to reemphasize, the Mayor started out by talking about "this is not a rich man/poor man"
fight, and I would sort of like to close reemphasizing that. I represent a ward greatly affected by
this from whom I've been receiving many, many comments of not wanting this to go through.
We are adjacent to an area that just had two crashes recently from North Las vase, Las Vegas
Airport. We also have air quality problems. We went through a big thing with the high school in
the ward I represent, a big thing with all of the new expansion of the freeways and this is not an
affluent ward. This is not Summerlin that they, it seems the media has picked up that it's
Summerlin and rich people. This is not what this is about and I wanted to reemphasize that from
the Ward I represent. And my ward is adjacent to Mr., Councilman Weekly's ward and I know
the same holds true for the residents that we're adjacent to. So I, I think I've emphasized from
day one the safety factor, my concern about the North Las Vegas Airport, also we had such
helicopter traffic from the hospital and from Metro in the areas. And again, these are not affluent
areas. And I just hope that our being able to support you today will help us get the answers that,
as Councilman Brown said, our constituents desire.

MAYOR GOODMAN

357 Thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN

360 Thank you.

MAYOR GOODMAN

363 Any other comments? Mayor Pro Tem.

COUNCILMAN REESE

Thank you, Your Honor. Ma'am, I appreciate you being here. I've had, deal with the FAA for about ten years over the helicopter noise along the strip; the neighbors to the east. I find it very frustrating. I – find that they just like catching a laugh. I think that the only thing I've accomplished is maybe that there's as many helicopters still flying in the area, they just fly maybe

January 3, 2007

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 47 and 48

a little bit higher and I can't tell how, if they are flying any higher or not. I – do have, the area that I represent it's not really gonna be affected by this too much, but I feel like that I've been elected to represent all the people, the City of Las Vegas, especially the people that elected me in my ward. I – have had a few of them that have called me and expressed concerns over the amount of money that were gonna be spent. It seems like they don't call and talk about the money we spent on the new parks, you know, on the other side of town. And – I really hope that those people that have called me look at this and - listen to what I'm trying to say is that I am gonna support the motion. I really feel like that it can be, it has been, it will be, I don't know, and that's talking about detrimental to our economy. God forbid if we do have any type of an accident anywhere in the Valley or in the state. We depend upon the tourist coming here and yes, the airplanes have to take off and land over somewhere. I understand all that. That's what my, I'm just repeating what my constituents have told me. And I just feel like we have to make sure that all of us up at this dais support one another in – those needs that we have. And I really feel like that it's important that we do at least explore the possibilities of maybe winning this – suit. And I – you got my support on, I hope we do win. And I – just feel it's important to – state those on the record because like I said, I want those people that have elected me, that I do support them. I think it's really necessary to spend this money to make sure that we do everything we can to make the City safe.

387388

389

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

MAYOR GOODMAN

390 All right. Thank you, very much. Councilman Ross.

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

COUNCILMAN ROSS

Thank you, Your Honor. I feel like the lone gun here. I had many constituents in Ward 6 contact my office not wanting this money to be spent in this capacity. We are not affected by this right turn; however, as I've shared with Councilman Wolfson, if this was affecting my ward, I'd be carrying a flag and a torch as well. And that's what my constituents would want. That being said, we're faced with our own challenges in Ward 6 in the northwest along with Councilman Weekly and Councilman (sic) Tarkanian with this North Las Vegas Airport. So, I did a little

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF January 3, 2007 ATIM TRANSCRIPT HTEMS 47 and 41

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 47 and 48

399	homework,	Councilwoman	and Councilmen	, if you –	you'll indulge me.

North Las Vegas Airport's the second busiest airport in the state of Nevada. In 1999, over 40
incidents reported to the FAA not resulting in crashes, but since 1983, there's been over 100.
There's been over 50 crashes at the North Las Vegas Airport resulting in 17 deaths. This does
not, this record does not include injuries and that's been reported by the National Transportation
Safety Board. The Mianni family in 2004 was killed in a crash in the North Las Vegas Airport,
and I believe Mrs. Mianni worked here at the City of Las Vegas. In 1999, an airplane crashed
into a yard on Sysc Street about three blocks from my previous home in Ward 6. Two planes
crashed within three days in this last year and last November with one plane crashing at
Cheyenne and Clayton, another plane crashing at Jones and Rancho. North Las Vegas Airport
has an average of 232 thousand take offs and landings per year, that's tremendous. I don't know
what McCarran's numbers are. Since November 2006, North Las Vegas Airport had 37 percent
of the traffic that McCarran had with an airport the fraction of the size. I previously did not
support this initiative to fight this because I, at the current time, the consolidated tax has been flat
for the past quarter. Spending a signi - significant amount of the money has been a great interest
to the residents of Ward 6 and, as I represent their interests, I also count Mayor Pro Tem
represent the interest of this entire City. After doing my homework on the North Las Vegas
Airport and public safety issues dealing with the North Las Vegas Airport, I've changed my mind
and I want a, I'm not going to apologize to those residents in Ward 6 for joining the fight because
I think it's prudent. It is our responsibility to not only protect, my responsibility, not only to
protect the residents in Ward 6, but this entire City. And if that includes the County residents,
Mayor, then so be it. It is our responsibility as well.

MAYOR GOODMAN

423 All right. Thank you, very much.

COUNCILMAN ROSS

426 Thank you.

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF January 3, 2007 VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 47 and 48

427	COUNCILMAN WOLFSON
428	Mayor Goodman, I'm sorry.
429	
430	MAYOR GOODMAN
431	Yes.
432	
433	COUNCILMAN WOLFSON
434	Just for clarification.
435	
436	MAYOR GOODMAN
437	Certainly.
438	
439	COUNCILMAN WOLFSON
440	I don't know if it's been said, but I want to make sure it is said. The figures that we're talking
441	about right now which is \$57,000 for Williams Aviation and \$300,000, Dr. Lichman, for your
442	firm. Those are projected maximum amounts. We're not writing you a check today. We're not
443	writing Williams Aviation a check today. These are projected possible maximum amounts. You
444	will be billing us on a periodic basis so we may not spend those kinds of monies. Is that a fair
445	statement?
446	
447	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
448	That's correct with one change. That's an estimate. It could be much less, it could be more,
449	depending on this Council's decision. If this Council wishes to pursue something further, who
450	knows. These things tend to get, I – am very much in favor of this monthly report because these
451	things tend to get out of hand, and we want to come back to the Council and talk to you about
452	where you want to go each step of the way so that nobody comes back later and says, my
453	constituents said you spent way too much money, didn't get the results. This is fine, but the
454	answer, yes, be sure, estimate, pure estimate. It could be much less than that. It could be much
455	less because we may decide to hold this open if our numbers don't work.

January 3, 2007

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 47 and 48

456 COUNCILMAN WOLFSON

- Well, periodically, we'll be able to assess that and we, as the Council, will make the decisions
- along the way.

459

- 460 DR. BARBARA LICHMAN
- 461 Absolutely.

462

463 COUNCILMAN WOLFSON

464 Thank you.

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

MAYOR GOODMAN

Very good, thank you. My experience on the Las Vegas Convention Visitors Authority Board has led me to the suggestion that we have these monthly reports because of when they were building the south portion of our convention center, there, the monthly reports were not made, and it was too late to stop everybody from going overboard. But now in our current construction, at every meeting, there's a report given to us so we're able to evaluate whether or not the money is being spent wisely. So, that's going to be part of my motion that on a monthly basis, you report to this Council as to your progress and a justification of your billing even though we value, you know, your professional position. I am also going to, as part of my motion, direct the manager to advise the County that we expect them, as a matter of equity and fairness based on the air quality issue that has been brought to our attention today to evaluate that. Several years ago, our participation, as far as air quality in this Valley was concerned, was taken away from us. Almost in a midnight raid- type manner. The health district, which we have two representatives, was responsible for air quality issues and it has been seeded to the County at this point in time. Now, it's being brought to our attention that this is a real issue and this is not a Valley that has lines in it. These are artificial boundaries that separate the cities from counties and alike. So, I – expect them equitably to seriously evaluate this and – join with us on the fight if for no other reason to protect their position with air quality because those particulates and the carbon monoxide, it doesn't say we're gonna drop in Las Vegas. It's

485	right out there at McCarran and that's going to affect their air quality as well. So, that would be			
486	part of my motion and I would move to also approve the items in 47 and 48 on those			
487	conditions. That's my motion. Yes.			
488				
489	BRAD JERBIC			
490	Sir before you vote, with all due respect and with your permission, I want to clarify this monthly			
491	report idea. It could be done in many different ways. Typically, what might happen is Dr.			
492	Lichman would – send a letter to my office which I would share with the Councilmembers and it			
493	you want personal contact, we need to discuss that now. If you want -			
494				
495	MAYOR GOODMAN			
496	In the beginning – my motion would include personal contact.			
497				
498	BRAD JERBIC			
499	We could do that a couple different ways as well. Under the Open Meeting Law, I think we're			
500	allowed to have a closed session to discuss pending litigation and if that is also (inaudible), we			
501	could agenda this for a month, month and a half from now, have Dr. Lichman present, we could			
502	do it in the back room, and you could then ask any question you want. You couldn't take any			
503	action but you could collect reports.			
504				
505	MAYOR GOODMAN			
506	That's fine. And then I could come out and tell the public what the status is. That's good. That'd			
507	be part of the motion as well. All right. That's as to Items 47 and 48. Please vote. Post. Motion			
508	carries (UNANIMOUS). Thank you and thank you for being with us today.			
509				
510	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN			
511	And thank you for having me.			

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF January 3, 2007 VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 47 and 48

512	MAYOR GOODMAN	
513	And good luck to you.	
514		
515	DR. BARBARA LICHMAN	
516	To all of us.	
517		
518	MAYOR GOODMAN	
519	Right.	
520		(END OF DISCUSSION)
521	/yy;lc	